

Appl. No. 10/518,145  
Response to Office Action mailed April 6, 2007

RECEIVED  
CENTRAL FAX CENTER Atty Dkt. No. 114216-016

JUL 6 2007

REMARKS

The non-final Office Action was issued on pending claims 5, 13, 16, 17 and 19. Claims 5, 13, 16, 17 and 19 stand rejected. In this Response, claim 1 has been amended and no claims have been added or cancelled. Thus, claims 5, 13, 16, 17 and 19 are pending in the application.

Applicants invite the Examiner to call Applicants' Representative to discuss any issues with this application.

Claim Rejections – 35 USC §103

In the Office Action at page 2, claims 5, 13, 16 and 17 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Silberman (US 2,060,830) in view of Watanabe et al. (US 5,023,394). In the Office Action at pages 2 and 3, claim 19 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Silberman in view of Watanabe et al. and Masataka (JP 2001-204515). Applicants respectfully disagree.

Claim 5 has been amended to clarify the claim. Amended claim 5 pertains to a slide fastener, and calls for "wherein a first edge part of a fastener tape plated onto the surface thereof to form a shield coating is folded inward to form an overlaid folded part and to have overlaid contact of the shield coating between front and back surfaces of the fastener tape; a core material is inserted into the folded part; a fastener element is attached to the folded part with the core material being interposed; the fastener tape is sewn in the vicinity of an installation part of the fastener element with a sewing thread; the fastener element is made of metal and attached by clamping the folded part, the fastener element having a fitting head and a pair of legs projecting from the fitting head so as to clamp the folded part; and the sewing thread is provided at a position spaced apart from the legs."

Features of Applicants' claimed slide fastener include "a first edge part of a fastener tape plated onto the surface thereof to form a shield coating is folded inward to form an overlaid folded part and to have overlaid contact of the shield coating between front and back surfaces of the fastener tape." One example of Applicants' invention is shown in Figure 5. A slide fastener has a first edge part 12 of a fastener tape 2 plated onto the surface thereof to form a shield

Appl. No. 10/518,145  
Response to Office Action mailed April 6, 2007

Atty Dkt. No. 114216-016

coating 7 is folded inward to form an overlaid folded part 4 and to have overlaid contact of the shield coating 7 between front and back surfaces of the fastener tape 2.

Turning to Silberman, Silberman pertains to a slide operative fastener structure. The Silberman slide operative fastener structure has opposed stringers 10 and 11. However, the stringers 10 and 11 are not plated onto the surface thereof to form a shield coating as claimed by Applicants in claim 1. Indeed, the Office Action at page 2 acknowledges that the Silberman tape isn't plated.

As to Watanabe et al., Watanabe et al. describes a fastener tape made of fabric which is plated with a conductive metal. However, Watanabe et al. does not show, describe or suggest that the conductive metal plated fastener tape 11 be folded inward to form an overlaid folded part and to have overlaid contact of the conductive metal plate between front and back surfaces of the fastener tape 11. Merely because Silberman shows stringers 10 and 11 which are folded, does not mean that a Watanabe et al. conductive metal plated fastener tape would be folded to have overlaid contact with itself.

As to Masataka, that reference does not remedy the deficiencies of Silberman and Watanabe et al. Masataka describes a slide fastener base fabric made of polytrimethylene terephthalate that has yellowing resistance. Masataka does not show, describe or suggest the above-described features of the present invention as claimed in claim 5. Nor does Masataka provide a suggestion, motivation or incentive to modify Silberman and Watanabe et al. to achieve Applicants' invention as claimed in claim 5.

Therefore, claim 5 is allowable. The dependent claims are also allowable at least for the reasons that claim 5 is allowable.

Thus, Applicants submit that the §103 rejections should be withdrawn.

Appl. No. 10/518,145  
Response to Office Action mailed April 6, 2007

Atty Dkt. No. 114216-016

RECEIVED  
CENTRAL FAX CENTERCONCLUSION


JUL 06 2007

For the foregoing reasons, Applicants submit that the patent application is in condition for allowance and request a Notice of Allowance be issued.

Respectfully submitted,  
EVEREST INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY LAW GROUP

Date: July 6, 2007

BY



Michael S. Leonard, Reg. No. 37,557  
P.O. Box 708  
Northbrook, IL 60065  
Phone: (847) 272-3400